

Remarks:

Applicant has studied the Office Action dated 06-29-05, and has amended the claims to distinctively claim the subject matter of the invention. By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 11, 17 have been amended, claim 5 is canceled. No new matter has been added. Support for the new claims and the amendments is found within the specification and the drawings. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection(s):

It is respectfully noted that anticipation of claims using a drawing requires that "the picture must show all the claimed structural features and how they are put together" and "[t]he drawings must be evaluated for what they reasonably disclose and suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art." M.P.E.P. §2125. Furthermore, anticipation of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a), (b) and (e) requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," that "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim" and "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." M.P.E.P. §2131.

The claims have been amended to recite a system and method for controlling data communications between a single external interface of an electronic device and at least two (i.e. first and second) chips or processors both included in the electronic device. Each of the first and second chips are configured for communicating with the first external interface. *That is, a single external interface is provided in the device for routing data communicated to both of the first and second chips.*

As recited in the amended claims, the first chip has a first universal asynchronous receiver-transmitters (UART), a first microcontroller, and a switching mechanism capable of connecting the first UART and the first microcontroller. The second chip has a second microcontroller and a second UART connecting the second microcontroller to the first UART.

To avoid collision and to manage the communication process between the single external port and the two separate UARTs, a two step process is recited. First, signals communicated to the first chip from at least one of the first external interface and the second UART are monitored. Then, data between the first external interface and the second microcontroller is communicated via the first and second UARTs in response to the switching mechanism detecting a predetermined signal. *It is noteworthy, that the first and*

*second steps are performed without intervention of a second external interface of the electronic device, as recited in the amended claims.*

Neither of the cited references provide a system and method that allows for at least two processors in an electronic device to communicate with a single external device of the electronic device for both sending and receiving data from an external device. Particularly, USPN 5,884,102 (England) discloses a communication process between two separate devices (i.e., personal computer 300 and external modem 310), each device having a separate processor (i.e., CPU 302 and Modem processor 312), wherein each of the processors communicate via a dedicated external interface (i.e., serial ports 308 and 311).

In other words, England teaches away from the claimed system and method as amended by disclosing the prior art state of affairs where each processor sends and receives data via a dedicated external port. In contrast, the system and methods recited in amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 17 claim a single external interface in communication with at least two processors in a single electronic device.

Thus, the present invention provides a novel method of communication between processors and external interfaces in a single device, so that each processor does not require a dedicated external interface. Instead, more than one processor may communicate with an external device through a single external interface.

Since the England reference fails to disclose at least one of the recited elements in the amended claims, and furthermore teaches away from the recited method and system as noted above, a rejection under § 102 or § 103 using this reference would be improper.

For the above reasons, the invention as recited in the amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 17 is distinguishable over the references cited by the Examiner. Claims 2-4, 7-10, 12-16 and 18, respectively depending on claims 1, 6, 11, and 17 should also be in condition for allowance by the virtue of their dependence on allowable base claims.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless

Applicants have expressly argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number [310] 789 2100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 29, 2005

By: 

F. Jason Far-hadian, Esq.  
Registration No. 42,523

CENTURY IP GROUP  
PO BOX 7333  
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92658  
Telephone: [310] 789 2100